



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/683,883	10/09/2003	Chang Hwan Lee	AISC-64729	7885
24201	7590	06/03/2005	EXAMINER	
FULWIDER PATTON LEE & UTECHT, LLP HOWARD HUGHES CENTER 6060 CENTER DRIVE TENTH FLOOR LOS ANGELES, CA 90045			FETSUGA, ROBERT M	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3751	

DATE MAILED: 06/03/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

6

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/683,883

Applicant(s)

LEE, CHANG HWAN

Examiner

Robert M. Fetsuga

Art Unit

3751

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 April 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,7-10 and 16-18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,7-10 and 16-18 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 09 October 2003 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

1. The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the "assembling" step set forth in claims 10 and 18 and "interengaging" steps set forth in claims 10-18 must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered.

Applicant argues at page 7 of the response filed April 22, 2005 these steps are disclosed at page 2, line 22 - page 4, line 19, and comprise elements 20,22. However, the noted pages were again reviewed, but no disclosure of any assembling or interengaging steps was found.

Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. The replacement sheet(s) should be labeled "Replacement Sheet" in the page header (as per 37 CFR

Art Unit: 3751

1.84(c)) so as not to obstruct any portion of the drawing figures. If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

2. The specification is objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. See 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1) and MPEP § 608.01(o). Correction of the following is required: Proper antecedent basis for the "securing means" set forth in claims 9 and 18 could not be found in the specification. Applicant is reminded claim terminology in mechanical cases should appear in the descriptive portion of the specification by reference to the drawing(s).

Applicant argues at page 7 of the response the securing means "correspond" to the disclosed securing elements, and forms "statutory means claims". However, the term "securing means" is not found in the specification, and can not be considered a means-plus-function limitation. Concerning the latter, significant structure has been added to the claims which precludes a means-plus-function interpretation.

3. Claims 1-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in

Art Unit: 3751

the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

Claim 1 recites a system "for enabling the assembly of a front panel... to each of a pair of side panels" where securing elements are "complementary" and "interengagable".

Implementation of this subject matter is neither taught in the instant disclosure nor evident to the examiner. Claims 9, 10 and 18 recite similar subject matter.

Applicant argues at page 7 of the response the "enablement description" is set forth in the response to the drawing objection. However, the drawing response noted supra does not point to any teaching as to how the claimed subject matter might be accomplished. Moreover, the argued section of the specification is merely conclusory. This conclusion is particularly troublesome as elements 20 and 22 would appear to be oriented at a 90 deg. relative to one another when the sauna cabin has been assembled.

4. Claims 9, 10 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 9 is redundant to claim 1 since applicant states at page 7 of the response the securing elements and securing means

Art Unit: 3751

are the same subject matter. Claim 18 is similarly indefinite with respect to claim 10.

Claim 10 is unclear as to whether the "sauna cabin" is intended to be part of the claimed combination since structure of the "system" is defined as being connected thereto (lns. 11-14), but no positive structural antecedent basis therefor has been defined. Claim 18 is similarly indefinite. Applicant argues at page 8 of the response the claims do not include the sauna cabin as part of the claimed combination. However, this statement contradicts the plain language at lines 14-16 of claim 10, for example.

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

6. Claims 1, 7-10 and 16-18, as best understood, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Wheat.

The Wheat reference discloses an assembly comprising: a plurality of securing elements/securing means 13 including side securable portions 15 and a medial interengaging portion 16; and panels 10,10a, as claimed. The initial statement of intended

use (sauna cabin), and all other functional implications related thereto (front, side), have been considered but do not appear to impose any patentably distinguishing structure over that disclosed by Wheat.

Applicant argues at page 8 of the response perceived features disclosed by Wheat which are not disclosed by applicant. However, this does not address the rejection of the claims over the Wheat disclosure. The structure recited in the claims (as best understood) is clearly met by Wheat, and applicant has not made any showing to the contrary.

7. Applicant is referred to MPEP 714.02 and 608.01(o) in responding to this Office action.

8. Applicant's remarks have been fully considered and have been previously addressed.

9. The grounds of rejection have been reconsidered in light of applicant's arguments, but are still deemed to be proper.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened

Art Unit: 3751

statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Robert M. Fetsuga at telephone number 571/272-4886 who can be most easily reached Monday through Thursday.



Robert M. Fetsuga
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3751